UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,388	07/01/2003	Jong Huang	MFCP.103969	9393

45809 7590 07/13/2007

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
(c/o MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
2555 GRAND BOULEVARD
KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613

EXAMINER	
HOANG, HIEU T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2152	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
07/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/609,388	HUANG, JONG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hieu T. Hoang	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3 and 5-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3, 5-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to communication filed on 06/05/2007.

2. Claim 4 is canceled.

3. Claims 1-3 and 5-29 are pending.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 06/05/2007 have been fully considered but they are found unpersuasive.

5. The first argument is in regards to independent claim 1 and presented on page 8 of the Remarks, wherein the applicant argues that the prior art does not teach "the web server further comprising an image store for storing rendered images". It is maintained that the prior art does teach the web server further comprising an image store for storing rendered image (Barber, fig. 1, ISP with a transformer, fig. 2, the transformer has a storage device 234, col. 7 lines 37-41, rendered images can be stored in a cache for quick future transfer).

6. The second argument is in regards to independent claims 9, 16, and 29 and presented on page 9 of the Remarks, wherein the applicant argues that the prior art does not teach "the requested version of the image is received in a format that includes a name of an image file, a maximum width for the requested image, a maximum height for the requested image, a rendering style for the requested image and an extension of the image file." It is maintained that the prior art does teach "the requested version of the image is received in a format that includes a name of an image file, a maximum

width for the requested image, a maximum height for the requested image, a rendering style for the requested image and an extension of the image file" (Barber, col. 3 line 45-col. 4 line 3, requested image size (width*height) and style (16 color restriction or transformation by encoding or compression) and extension (JPEG, GIF), it is inherent that each digital image has a distinct file name).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-14, 16-20, 23, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barber et al. (US 6,128,668, hereafter Barber).

9. For claim 1, Barber discloses a system for transmitting a requested image to a user (abstract), the system comprising:

- a media server comprising a content store for storing an original version of an image (figure 1, web site server 102, col. 5 lines 12-13 and 24-33) and a media handler including a rendering component for rendering a requested version of the image from the original version (col. 5 lines 54-62, a transformer integrated to the web site server is used to transform a

media object using preferences entered by a user, col. 7 lines 9-14), wherein the requested image is requested by the user from a computing system (fig. 1, user end unit 116); and

- a web server, other than the computing system (fig. 1, ISP 110), for seeking the requested image, the web server comprising a web server media handler for seeking the requested image from the media server and for returning the requested image to the user (fig. 1, col. 5 lines 33-36, ISP 110 forwards requests for media objects to web site server 102 and then receives and forwards the media objects to user 116), the web server further comprising an image store for storing rendered image (fig. 1, ISP with a transformer, fig. 2, the transformer has a storage device 234, col. 7 lines 37-41, rendered images can be stored in a cache for quick future transfer).

10. For claim 9, Barber discloses a media server system for transmitting a requested image to a web server (abstract), the media server system comprising:

- a content store for storing an original version of an image (figure 1, web site server 102, col. 5 lines 12-13 and 24-33); and
- a media handler including an image retrieval component for retrieving the original version of the image from the content store (col. 5 lines 12-13, server 102 hosts media and multimedia objects, off course, it has to contain a retrieval component to retrieve and provide the objects as needed), an image rendering component

for rendering a requested version of the image based on the original version (col. 5 lines 54-62, a transformer is used to transform a media object), and an image transmission component for transmitting the requested version of the image (col. 7 lines 42-44), wherein the requested version of the image is received in a format that includes a name of an image file, a maximum width for the requested image, a maximum height for the requested image, a rendering style for the requested image and an extension of the image file (col. 3 line 45-col. 4 line 3, requested image size (width*height) and style (16 color restriction or transformation by encoding or compression) and extension (JPEG, GIF), it is inherent that each digital image has a distinct file name).

11. For claim 16, Barber discloses a method for providing a requested image to a user (abstract), the method comprising:

- storing an original image in a content store of a media server (figure 1, web site server 102, col. 5 lines 12-13 and 24-33);
- rendering a requested version of the original image using a media handler (col. 5 lines 54-62, a transformer is used to transform a media object); and
- returning the requested version (fig. 1, col. 5 line 60, col. 7 lines 42-44, web site server returns rendered images to user), wherein the requested version of the image is received in a format that includes a name of an image file, a maximum width for the requested image, a maximum height for the requested image, a rendering style for the requested image and an extension of the image

file (col. 3 line 45-col. 4 line 3, requested image size (width*height) and style (16 color restriction or transformation by encoding or compression) and extension (JPEG, GIF), it is inherent that each digital image has a distinct file name).

12. For claim 29, Barber discloses a memory for storing data accessible to a requester (figure 1, web site server 102, col. 5 lines 12-13 and 24-33), the memory comprising:

- a content management system for storing an original image version in a content store (figure 1, web site server 102, col. 5 lines 12-13 and 24-33);
- an image rendering component for rendering a requested version of an image from the original image version (col. 5 lines 54-62, a transformer is used to transform a media object), wherein the requested version of the image is received in a format that includes a name of an image file, a maximum width for the requested image, a maximum height for the requested image, a rendering style for the requested image and an extension of the image file (col. 3 line 45-col. 4 line 3, requested image size (width*height) and style (16 color restriction or transformation by encoding or compression) and extension (JPEG, GIF), it is inherent that each digital image has a distinct file name);
- an image caching component for caching the rendered image in an image store (col. 7 lines 39-41); and

- an image retrieval and forwarding component for forwarding the rendered image to the requestor (col. 7 lines 42-44).

13. For claims 2, 11, and 12, Barber further discloses the media handler comprises an image store and an image caching component for caching rendered images in the image store (col. 7 lines 39-41, the cache location is read as the image store where rendered images are cached for future use).

14. For claims 5 and 18, the claims are rejected for the same rationale as claim 2.

15. For claims 3, 13, and 19, Barber further discloses the media handler comprises an image retrieval and forwarding component for retrieving rendered images from the image store and forwarding rendered images to the web server (fig. 1, col. 5 line 60, given that transformer 112 is in web site server 102, col. 7 lines 39-41, transformer can retrieve rendered images from its cache and transfer it to the ISP 110 (or the web server)).

16. For claims 6, 14, and 20, Barber further discloses the media server comprises a content management system for controlling the content store (col. 5 lines 12-32, a database system for organizing stored media or multimedia objects in various format depending on media type).

17. For claims 8, 10, and 17, Barber further discloses the media handler renders an image having a smaller file size than an original file size of the original version (col. 7 lines 23-30 and lines 9-14, the lossy specifications defined by the user help reduce image size, therefore reduce the bandwidth required for the transfer).

18. For claims 23, Barber further discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in claims 16 and 24 (col. 6 lines 19-29).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

20. Claim 22 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable under Barber, as applied to claim 16 above, in view of Tso (US 6,421,733, hereafter Tso).

21. For claims 22, Barber discloses the invention substantially as described in claim 16. Barber does not explicitly disclose rendering the image version comprises determining an image size based on a file name.

However, Tso discloses Barber does not explicitly disclose rendering the image version comprises determining an image size based on a file name (col. 5 lines 56-57, col. 6 lines 9-23, GetScaledObject() function has a URL link to an media type such as an image, and OutParams or output scaled parameters of the requested image).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Barber and Tso in order to request for a particular version of an image using the file name with image output parameters as described by Tso to advantageously manage the provision of requested content to the network client (Tso, col. 5 lines 60-61).

22. Claim 24-28 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable under Tso in view of Barber.

23. For claim 24, Tso discloses a method for transmitting a requested image to a user upon receiving a user request for the image at a web server (fig. 5 HTTP local proxy is a web server), the method comprising:

- searching for the requested image in a web server image store (col. 13 lines 40-44, fig. 7 step 120, local proxy is read as a web server);
- requesting the requested image from a media server if the requested image is not in the web server image store (col. 13 lines 46-47, fig. 8 steps 160),
- searching a media server cache for the requested image if the requested image is not in the web server image store (col. 14 lines 25-30, fig. 8 step 170);

- retrieving an original version of the requested image from a media center content store if the requested image is not in the media server cache (fig. 8 steps 190, 210, 230, col. 3 lines 17-20, col. 15 lines 32-35, when transcoder 20 is in a content server, or when reading transcoding server 34 in fig. 5 as a content server (or a media server), there is no need for step 260 in fig. 9 because the content server already has a storage of original media objects);
- rendering the requested version of the image from the original version (fig. 9 steps 240, 250); and
- returning the requested image (fig. 9 steps 260).

Tso does not explicitly disclose the requested version of the image is received in a format that includes a name of an image file, a maximum width for the requested image, a maximum height for the requested image, a rendering style for the requested image and an extension of the image file.

However, Barber discloses the requested version of the image is received in a format that includes a name of an image file, a maximum width for the requested image, a maximum height for the requested image, a rendering style for the requested image and an extension of the image file (col. 3 line 45-col. 4 line 3, requested image size (width*height) and style (16 color restriction or transformation by encoding or compression) and extension (JPEG, GIF), it is inherent that each digital image has a distinct file name)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Barber and Tso in order to take advantage of

varying efficiencies for different multimedia objects and provide media objects that best meets the user's needs (Barber, col. 3 line 65-col. 4 line 3)

24. For claim 25, Tso further discloses implementing a content management system to notify the web server of changes to original images in the content store (fig. 9 steps 240, 250, 260, and 270, transcoded objects is sent to and stored in local proxy cache, local proxy can be read as web server).

25. For claim 26, Tso further discloses rendering the requested version comprises creating an image file having a smaller file size than a file size of the original version (col. 8 lines 22-28, lossy compression is used to compress media to reduce data that is transmitted to the client).

26. For claim 27, Tso further discloses selecting an image rendering size based on an image file name (col. 5 lines 56-57, col. 6 lines 9-23, GetScaledObject() function has a URL link to an media type such as an image, and OutParams or output scaled parameters of the requested image).

27. For claim 28, Tso further discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method recited in claim 24 (col. 12 lines 46-52).

28. Claims 7, 15, and 21 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable under Barber, as applied to claims 6, 14, and 16 above, in view of Guedalia (US 2003/0135867)

29. For claims 7, 15, and 21, Barber discloses the invention substantially as described in claims 6, 14, and 16. Barber does not disclose the content management system includes a notification mechanism for providing image updates to the web server.

However, Guedalia discloses the content management system includes a notification mechanism for providing image updates to the web server ([0207], outdated media data is removed from the cache, and inventory flags (or notification mechanism) are reset to indicate that outdated data is no longer in the cache).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Barber and Guedalia in order to remove outdated media data from the cache to save storage space and further provide updated media data to the user.

Conclusion

30. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Kaasila et al. US 2003/0137522. Innovations for the display of web pages.
- Mitchell. US 6,741,841. Dual receiver for a on-board entertainment system.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

31. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HH

HH

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
7/15/7